



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,135	08/16/2001	Takanori Nishimura	212768US6	1259
22850	7590 09/21/2005		EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			MEUCCI, MICHAEL D	
	A, VA 22314		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBE	
•	,		2142	
			DATE MAILED: 09/21/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/930,135 NISHIMURA ET AL.		<b></b>
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael D. Meucci	2142	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence add	dress
THE REPLY FILED <u>02 September 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE 1	THIS APPLICATION IN CONDI	TION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to of this application, applicant must timely file one of the for places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in confollowing time periods:</li> </ol>	ollowing replies: (1) an amendm Notice of Appeal (with appeal t npliance with 37 CFR 1.114. Th	nent, affidavit, or other evid fee) in compliance with 37	lence, which CFR 41.31; or
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later			er is later. In no
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN		D WITHIN TWO
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.0 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		1 136(a) and the appropriate ex	tension fee have
peen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more armed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in confiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must	statutory period for reply originally senths after the mailing date of the final original part original part of the final original part original part origin	et in the final Office action; or (2 rejection, even if timely filed, m nust be filed within two mon .37(e)), to avoid dismissal	e) as set forth in (b) ay reduce any nths of the date of the appeal.
MENDMENTS	·		
3. A The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection (a) They raise new issues that would require further (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE begins of the content of the conten	consideration and/or search (s		because
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in appeal; and/or		rially reducing or simplifyin	g the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling	a corresponding number of fir	nally rejected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(	• •		•
1. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR		Non-Compliant Amendmer	nt (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would b the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	e allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amend	ment canceling
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): how the new or amended claims would be rejected is The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: None. Claim(s) objected to: None. Claim(s) rejected: 1-17. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.		) 🔲 will be entered and ar	n explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	but before or on the data of fil	ing a Nation of Annact will	not be entered
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action because applicant failed to provide a showing of good</li> </ol>			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

13. Other: \_\_\_\_

and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

See Continuation Sheet.

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be

11. 🔀 The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the argued claims were addressed in the final action. Additionally, the applicant brings forth new arguments which should have been included in the applicant's previous response. As such, the claims remain rejected as stated in the final action. The cited Murphy clearly discloses sending reservation request information (see lines 34-40 of column3, emphasis added); Murphy also clearly discloses sending notification information etc. (see lines 42-45 of column 11 and lines 27-34 of column 12). Again, the applicant argues limitations NOT in the claims. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "sending reservation request information for third parties and then notifying the third party the content distributon will be performed") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER